

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/785,349	02/24/2004	Antoine LaFont	S63.2-9776US02	8749	
490	7590 08/01/2	06	EXAMINER		
•	RETT & STEINK	SCHILLINGER, ANN M			
SUITE 2000	CIRCLE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNETONKA, MN 55343-9185			3738		
			DATE MAILED: 08/01/200	DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	10/785,349	LAFONT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ann Schillinger	3738
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IF Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perioder in the provision of th	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a re d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON- tte, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  pply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24.  2a)□ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th  3)□ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matte	· ·
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 9-29 is/are w 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	rithdrawn from consideration	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to be a by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected to be a by the Examination is	are: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ one drawing(s) be held in abeyant ection is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	Paper No(s	tummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 

Art Unit: 3738

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 17, 2006 has been entered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mikus et al. (U.S. Application No. 2002/0035391). Mikus et al. discloses all of the following regarding claim 1: a method of treating a bodily vessel comprising the steps of (pg. 2, paragraph 0024): inserting a catheter having a distal portion into a body vessel, the distal portion having an expandable region, an expandable stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region; advancing the distal portion to a desired location in a bodily vessel; delivering the stent to the desired location by expanding the

Art Unit: 3738

expandable region from an unexpanded diameter to an expanded diameter (pg. 2, paragraph 0025); delivering heat to the stent during the expansion of the expandable region (pg. 3, paragraphs 0031 and 0036).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Boylan et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0187497). Mikus et al. does not disclose a stent that is at least partially constructed of stainless steel. Boylan et al., teaches the following regarding claim 2: the stent is at least partially constructed of stainless steel (pg. 1, paragraph 0007).

Regarding claim 6, Mikus et al. discloses the following: a method of treating a bodily vessel comprising the steps of (pg. 2, paragraph 0024): advancing a stent delivery catheter comprising a stent disposed about at least a portion of an expandable region to a desired location in a bodily vessel; delivering the stent in the bodily vessel at the desired location (pg. 2, paragraph 0025); and heating the stent during delivery (pg. 3, paragraph 0031 and 0036). Mikus et al. does not disclose the use of stainless steel to construct the catheter, but Boylan et al. teaches the following: constructed substantially of stainless steel (pg. 1, paragraph 0007) for the purpose of opening and maintaining the patency of the body lumen.

Regarding claim 7, Mikus teaches the following: the stent is conductively heated by directing energy to the stent through a portion of the catheter (pg. 3, paragraph 0031 and 0036).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the initial stent of the Mikus et al. reference in order to permanently deform the stent and hold open and maintain the patency of the body lumen.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Guglielmi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,995). Mikus et al does not disclose the use of heated contrast agent, but '995 teaches the following regarding claims 4 and 5: the expanded region is expanded by delivering a heated contrast agent to the expandable region; a heated contrast agent is delivered to the distal portion as the stent is delivered (col. 13, lines 28-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a contrast agent because it would allow for observance of the expansion of the stent and the behavior of the vessel wall.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Boylan et al. and in further view of Guglielmi et al. Mikus et al. and Boylan et al. do not explicitly disclose that the bodily vessel will also be heated when the stent is heated. However, '995 teaches the following: the bodily vessel is heated by the stent (col. 2, lines 1-7 and 25-26), which would prevent restenosis.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on January 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends that Mikus et al. does not teach an "expandable stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region." However, Figures 6 and 7 in Mikus et al. discloses the stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region. With this disclosure in Mikus et al., the additions of Boylan et al. and Guglielmi et al. are adequate to address the elements not taught by Mikus et al.

Regarding the word "about," the argument filed by the Applicant's representative is insufficient to overcome the rejection made on the independent claims. The term "about" has been interpreted broadly and does not provide any indication as to what range of specific activity is covered.

The Examiner has interpreted the word "about" broadly. In the Merriam-Webster Dictionary the broadest meaning of the word "about" is the following: "...reasonably close to...," "...in the vicinity...," etc. For the above reasons, the Examiner maintains the previous rejection.

In order to overcome the rejection, the Applicant's representative can substitute the word "about" by the word "above."

Application/Control Number: 10/785,349

Art Unit: 3738

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Schillinger whose telephone number is (571) 272-6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571)272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ann Schillinger July 17, 2006

ALVIN J. STEWART PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 6